

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, Examiner indicated that the claim numbers in the Listing of Claims and those in the Remarks/Arguments were incongruent, which has been corrected herein. Examiner also indicated that it was unclear as to why Applicant mentioned new species A as only species B was elected on 04/12/2006. Accordingly, claims 38–46, which read upon species A and were first presented in the response filed on 08/13/2008, have been cancelled herein.

Claims 1–46 have been cancelled and new claims 47–56 originally presented in the response filed on 08/13/2008, which read upon species B as elected on 04/12/2006, have been added. The new claims have been drafted pursuant to Examiner's previous rejections under 35 USC §§ 102, 103, and 112. It is Applicant's position that the new claims have been drafted with the appropriate limitations to overcome Examiner's previous rejections and objections in light of the remarks/arguments that follow.

Applicant herein argues that U.S. Patent No. 2,990,966 issued to Schramm (hereinafter Schramm), as cited by Examiner, does not anticipate Applicant's invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as currently presented in independent claim 47. Schramm does not anticipate claim 47 at least because there is no powered actuator disclosed therein.

Applicant herein also argues that U.S. Patent No. 3,012,682 issued to Williamson (hereinafter Williamson), as cited by Examiner, does not anticipate Applicant's invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as currently presented in independent claim 47. Williamson does not anticipate claim 47 at least because Williamson does not disclose a second rotating member.

Applicant herein argues that Schramm in light of Williamson does not render Applicant's invention obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as currently presented in independent claim 47. The combination of Schramm and Williamson does not render claim 47 obvious at least because neither Schramm nor Williamson disclose a second rotating member. Accordingly, Applicant's invention includes an element not disclosed in the prior art.

For the reasons cited above, neither Schramm nor Williamson standing alone or in combination render any of the dependent claims obvious or anticipated because all dependent claims ultimately depend from claim 47.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments to the claims and remarks, Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the outstanding rejections and issue a timely Notice of Allowance in this case. If a telephone conference would expedite allowance of the claims, the Examiner may wish to telephone Applicant's attorney at (563) 441-0207.

Respectfully submitted,  
William M. Smith



Date: February 25, 2009

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Jay R. Hamilton  
Reg. No. 50,644

Hamilton IP Law, PC  
331 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> St.  
New Ventures Center Suite 120  
Davenport, IA 52801  
Tel (563) 441-0207  
Fax (563) 823-4637